

## SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

### M.1 AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

As provided for in *FAR 52.215-1 Instructions to Offerors—Competitive Acquisitions*, the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with Offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the CO later determines them to be necessary. If the CO determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the CO may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly-rated proposals (see NFS 1815.306(c)(2)).

(End of Provision)

### M.2 SOURCE SELECTION AND EVALUATION FACTORS—GENERAL

**A. Source Selection:** This competitive acquisition will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.3, *Source Selection*, and NFS 1815.3, same subject. The attention of Offerors is particularly directed to NFS 1815.305, *Proposal Evaluation*, and NFS 1815.305-70, *Identification of Unacceptable Proposals*. A best value trade-off process, as described at FAR 15.101-1, will be used in making source selection.

**B. Evaluation Factors and Subfactors:** The evaluation factors are mission suitability, price, and past performance. These factors, as described at NFS 1815.304-70, will be used to evaluate each proposal. Section M provides a further description for each evaluation factor, inclusive of subfactors. Only the mission suitability factor is numerically scored in accordance with NFS 1815.304-70(b)(1).

**C. Relative Order of Importance of Evaluation Factors:** While only the mission suitability factor is numerically scored, in order to provide Offerors with an indication of the relative importance of the three factors, the following information is furnished in accordance with FAR 15.304(e):

**Mission Suitability, Price, and Past Performance are considered to be essentially equal to each other. Therefore, all evaluation factors other than price, when combined, are significantly more important than price.**

(End of Provision)

### M.3 MISSION SUITABILITY SECTION

**A.** The Offeror's mission suitability proposal response indicates the Offeror's understanding of the requirements of the statement of work (SOW) and the data procurement document (DPD), the Offeror's plan for satisfying those requirements, and the likelihood that the plan will result in effective and efficient performance. The content of the Offeror's mission suitability proposal

shall provide the basis for evaluation of the Offeror's response to the technical requirements of the RFP.

B. Mission Suitability is evaluated using the adjective rating system/definitions set forth in NFS 1815.305, Proposal Evaluation. The total potential score for mission suitability is 1,000 points. The numerical weights assigned to the two subfactors identified are indicative of the relative importance of those evaluation areas. The subfactors to be used in evaluating mission suitability and their corresponding weights are listed below:

<b>Subfactor</b>	<b>Points</b>
A) Technical Approach to the SOW/DPD Requirements Safety Requirements (300) + Mass and Volume (200) + Flexibility and Expandability (200)	700
B) Management/Schedule Approach to the SOW/DPD Requirements Management (150) + Schedule (150)	300
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,000</b>

C. Proposals will be assessed for strengths and weaknesses and scored based on the mission suitability subfactors set forth below.

#### **TA1            Technical Approach**

The Offeror's overall technical approach will be evaluated including

- a) Ability of the interface design between battery and sequencer to meet the safety requirements
- b) Ability to meet requirements that minimizes mass and volume
- c) Ability to provide flexibility and expandability of design

#### **MTS1            Management/Schedule Approach**

The Offeror's overall management and schedule approach will be evaluated.

(End of Provision)

### **M.6    PRICE SECTION**

A. Price is important in determining the Offeror's understanding of the requirements and the required resources. The consistency between the mission suitability factor and the price factor will be considered in determining the Offeror's understanding of the SOW and DPD.

B. The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.404 and NFS 1815.404. The following risk levels will be assessed to assist in determination of price reasonableness:

Low Risk	The evaluators have identified no price risks, or only minor price risks, that impact providing the requirements proposed and in accordance with the terms of the contract.
Medium Risk	The evaluators have has identified price risks that may impact, but not substantially impact, providing the requirements proposed and in accordance with the terms of the contract.
High Risk	The evaluators has identified price risks that may substantially impact providing the requirements proposed and in accordance with the terms of the contract.

C. The Offeror's reasonableness will be evaluated. The Offeror's Price proposal will be evaluated, using one or more of the techniques defined in FAR 15.404, in order to determine if the price is fair and reasonable. Proposals using existing commercial items, or existing commercial items with minor modifications are encouraged as a cost efficient approach.

(End of Provision)

## **M.7 PAST PERFORMANCE SECTION**

A. In accordance with the FAR 15.305(a)(2) and NFS 1815.304-70, the Offeror's overall corporate past performance will be evaluated. This area is not numerically scored but is assigned an adjective rating. The past performance evaluation will be based on information provided by the Offeror in their past performance section, the past performance evaluation forms and any other information obtained independently by the evaluators.

B. The adjectival rating system/definitions set forth in NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A) will be utilized in the evaluation of past performance. However, Offerors without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. Refer to FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv). A significant achievement, problem, or lack of relevant data can become an important consideration in the evaluation process. A neutral rating could be considered less favorable than a favorable past performance score.

C. The Offeror will be evaluated on the relevancy of past performance on (3) references and the quality of past performance on the same (3) references through a past performance evaluation form.

The Offeror's relevancy of past performance will be evaluated for all (3) references based on the following similarities to the Avionics Box Development:

- a. Contract value
- b. Scope relating to avionics systems, flight history and qualification of flight avionics
- c. Complexity in design and safety requirements similar to proposed effort

The Offeror's quality of past performance will be based on Past Performance Evaluation Forms completed by the (3) references. The evaluation form is found in Attachment L Appendix A. The offeror is advised to coordinate the sheet count with the reference point of contact to avoid having sheets returned.

(End of Provision)

[END OF SECTION]